

Appln. No. 10/589,020
Amd. dated July 17, 2008
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2008

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached New Sheet of drawings inserts new Fig. 4 and
Fig. 5.

Attachment: New Sheet

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 2-6 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, Applicant has amended the disclosure and provided new Figs. 4 and 5 to provide greater details with regard to the location and operation of the complementary couplings. However, Applicant does not understand the Examiner's reference to "designated shapes" and "the locking or latching mechanisms and release mechanisms in a form of a fork" as Applicant can find no equivalent language equivalent to the Examiner's terms in the claims and the Examiner has provided no numerical identification of which elements are involved. Applicant respectfully submits the Examiner's rejection, as far as understood, has now been overcome. If the Examiner does not agree, Applicant requests a further and more explicit explanation of the problem he believes is involved.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-12 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant has amended the disclosure and provided new Figs. 4 and 5 to more positively set forth the essential elements of the claimed invention. Applicant has further amended claim 1 to provide an antecedent basis for the complementary coupling set out in claim 2 and amended claim 9 to eliminate the problem identified by the Examiner in claim 10. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner's 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph rejection has now been overcome.

In response to the Examiner's objection to the drawings, Applicant has deleted the terms "Such as an inner and outer cone or

pyramid shape" and "a groove or edges, as well as," in claim 2 and have enclosed now Figs. 4 and 5 identifying the centering means (CM), angular orientation means (AOM) axial limit stops (AL) and locking piece (LP). As indicated above Applicant has found no reference to "locking and latching mechanisms and release devices in the form of a fork" in the claims. Applicant respectfully submits that, as far as understood Applicant has now overcome the Examiner's objection to the drawings.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1, 7-9, 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Salomon EP0997260 in view of Laempe DE29821047. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as applied to the claims as amended.

The claimed invention is directed to apparatus for covering profile material, wherein strips of a covering material are positioned and pressed continuously onto a profile by pressing rollers. The pressing rollers are carried by multiple-axis positioning means.

The claimed invention simplifies the adaptation of the apparatus to different profiles by providing that each of the claimed positioning means has an automatically actuatable coupling for the pressing roller wherein different pressing rollers can be stored in magazines where it is possible for them to be deposited and removed by the positioning means for use.

In comparison, Salomom illustrates and discloses the basic claimed apparatus, but teaches no changing of its tools in the manner claimed. Laempe discloses the changing of tools by a robot, but emphasize that the tools are held in the magazines by gravitational

Appln. No. 10/589,020
Amd. dated July 17, 2008
Reply to Office Action of March 17, 2008

force. There is no teaching whatever in Laempe in of couplings and complementary couplings, which facilitate the positioning of rollers in the magazine and there orientation in the apparatus. Laempe also fails to teach the characterizing part of the main claim.

Since the Examiner has only rejected only claims 1, 7-9, 11 and 12 on the basis of prior art and Applicant has overcome the Examiner's rejection of the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-6 and 10 are now allowable and that claims 1, 7-9, 11 and 12, patentably define over the cited prior art on the basis of the structural differences identified above.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By


Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:pp
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\B\Back\Wagner16\Pto\2008-07-17amendment.doc